SHORT-DURATION DISCUSSION

Constitution of National Security Council

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER (Gujarat): Madam Deputy Chairman, I shall proceed from the premise of the clarifications that have been furnished by the hon. Prime Minister the other day. I would neither like to make any inroads into the statement that has already been made, nor would I like to challenge the premise on which the hon. Prime Minister has been pleased to make his statement. I frankly confess but, I am not sure as to what weight would be given to the various perceptions and suggestions that might come from this side. I only hope—it is my expectation—the hon Prime Minister would, in the light of the various suggestions that might come from our side, consider the question whether it is really necessary to proceed further with the setting up of the National Security Council.

At the outset, the question that becomes most significant is, what is the necessity for this National Security Council? Is it because we have come to the conclusion that our defence strategy has failed, or, the war management that we had undertaken over the years has given way? If so, in what manner have we failed with the present structure that we have come to start thinking about some new perceptions and going in for the constitution of this National Security Council? Madam, I would like to submit that neither the statement nor the Resolution makes any reference whatsoever as to where we have failed.

We have had quite a few wars in the last 43 years. It has not been said that the war management was poor, or that the defence strategy that has been followed was not successful. So far as this document is concerned, there is not a single word about that. In fact, I will go that far to make a submission that the National Front Government has not questioned the formulation or implementation of the foreign policy or the defence policy of the Government which has been followed for the last quite a long number of years. What they have objected to, of course, is certain nuances in the relations with the neighbouring countries. Beyond that, the National Front Government has not questioned in any form the defence or the foreign policy or strategy. It is in this background one fails to appreciate as to why they have gone for the purposes of constituting the National Security Council.

Madam, what does the document say? On the purpose of the constitution of the National Security Council: I would not like to go into the statement. I would straightway go into the main document, the Resolution itself which says: "National Security Council, to consider all aspects of national security in a coordinative and comprehensive manner." That is the purpose for which the National Security Council is sought to be constituted. Now, is it the case of the Government that all aspects of the national security in a coordinative and comprehensive manner were not looked at by the structures that are existing? One would like to know these things. How have these structures failed? How are the present structures defective? In what manner have the infirmities gone in so that we are thinking that, we would like to improve on the present structures? Equally, it has been said, of course the language apart because I am finding that the stress is on a very garbled language, "the external geo-strategy environment and the internal situation in the country are changing rapidly." Are they changing rapidly in recent times? What had been happening. Why is that we have thought of the necessity? We would like to know, where is the change in the international environment that is taking place or had undergone so that we, as a peaceful country, have got to reshape the entire systemaic approach of our defence and the foreign relations? Is it necessary for us, and immediacly I will come to the United States of America? I would like to explain my position whether a countdy like ours does require a National Security Council of

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

this denomination and what we are aiming at? Is it merely theatrical? What type of message are we sending to the neighbouring country? After all, right up to 1959 our defence strategy or the policy was confined to our relations with Pakistan. After 1959 it became Pakistan and China. Practically, there is no other country in our neighbourhood other than these two countries with which we are expected to formulate our defence strategies in any form. Would you like to take upon yourself the role of an international policemen, or would you like to have, or do you have the surging ideas of developing a hegemony in the region so that you can think in terms of having an overall approach and...and evolving a policy which, in the long run, would enable you to become the leader, potential leader, of the region itself, because here it has been said: "the external geo-strategic environment and the international situation in the country are changing rapidly. The international environment has undergone dramatic changes which will inevitably lead to the establishment of new equilibria of power in different regions of the globe". If that be so, can you stand up to these things by yourself? Can you evolve a system whereby you would like to be a power to be reckoned with. Is it the intention of the Government?

Equally it has been said in paragraph 4 of the Resolution: "to evolve an integrated approach to policy-making as it affects national security, taking account of the linkages between the evolving external situation in the political, military and economic fields and our domestic situation. This should lead to the identification of strategies which optimise our efforts in defence, internal security and foreign affairs". Are you referring to these in the context of Pakistan? Because, otherwise, I see no ground all this verbosity and if that be so, what message are you conveying to Pakistan and its people? And what message are you conveying to our country? This is a matter which is serious and this should have been taken in a that very manner but the manner in which the whole thing has been put gives a peculiar impression—an impression of the surging feeling among the rulers either to become a regional power, or to send tremors down the spines of the rulers of Pakistan. This, in my view, is not a healthy situation.

I do not know whether this Council is sought to be constituted merely on the basis of the manifesto of the National Front Government. I doubt whether at the time when the manifest-itself was formulated, the National Front Government leaders ever took into consideration the divers perceptions themselves. Were they really subjective to the details of the decision, or had just taken the decision in a huff? It is very doubtful. But then, Mr. Prime Minister, I must submit that your Government seems to be taking too seriously each and every item of the manifesto itself...

SHRI M.S. GURUPADASWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Should it not be so?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER:... and has been trying to dilute it. Be it the case of the exemption of the people who are under debt to the tune of Rs. 10,000, which has been diluted in a way ultimately defeated the purpose of the manifesto itself, or even in the case of the Mandal Commission Report, if you would like to take it literally, you have said that the recommendations of the Mandal Commission will be implemented and only a part of it has been removed out of the plethora of recommendations in a total dilution of the recommendations themselves. Equally, we have been fed on the idea that the Right to work will be included in the Fundamental Rights. What has been said in the manifesto itself is in the most abstract form and if you take it seriously, then it is a case of providing the insurance for all the unemployed people. But

then it is being diluted and it is sought to be said that you will take into consideration the resources and so on and so forth. It is possible that even this idea might have been incorporated and endorsed in the manifesto in a very broad manner without, perhaps, going into the details thereof. If that is the idea, I would like you not to take seriously the entire manifesto itself and the various items which have been incorporated in the manifesto.

On the one side it is said that you would like to reduce the expenditure of the Government. If I correctly understand and if I have correctly read it in the newspapers, you have already issued orders that 20 per cent of the expenditure must be reduced of the various Governmental departments. In most cases, planned, unplanned expenditure everything, is reduced and it is in that background the concern is, you would like to set up a new secretariat. Government is already top-heavy, and you would like to increase the expenditure. What a contradiction in terms so far as the Government is concerned! On the one side you are facing a resource crunch and, on the other, you would like to increase the expenditure on a subject-matter which, really, does not warrant that it must be done at the earliest in any form whatsoever. And it is absolutely unnecessary also. But then, over an issue of this nature you would like to set up a secretariat and go in for further expenditure by various strategies which give an impression to the nation that it is a wasteful and uncalled-for expenditure, and goes contrary to the very professions of the National Front Government.

Now, let us first consider as to what exactly is the present structure and how the structure that is sought to be set up really differs. A comparative study would reveal, in my submission, that already organs and mechanisms of Defence and Security parameters exist so that no further structures are called for. Take the National Security Council itself. When you speak of a National Security Council, the membership of the National Security Council, as has been brought out in the Resolution itself, is nothing but of the Cabinet Committee on Political Affairs. Of course, a leverage has been provided that this National Security Council could associate the other Ministers and the Chief Ministers apart from the Ministers of Defence, External Affairs, Home Affairs and Finance, who are the regular members. But that position you can even now adopt in the CCPA itself. Mr. Prime Minister, in the erstwhile Government you were also a member of the CCPA and I was also a member of the CCPA, and we know its working. It has always the power to coopt, to call, any of the Ministers or Chief Ministers for the purpose of discussion, if it likes. Therefore, I see little difference between the CCPA and the National Security Council. And if you look up the business rules provided under article 77 of the constitionto which I will come at a later stage—the CCPA that has been constituted and the mandate that has been given to the CCPA is the same and similar.

The CCPA is the highest body after the Cabinet for the purpose of taking decisions on security issues and so on which you have referred to. If that be so, I would like to know how the present National Security Council materially differs and, in my submission, it is a futile exercise to have a National Security Council of this type. The second institution which has been thought of is the Strategic Core Group comprising representatives of the three Services and the representatives of the Ministers concerned headed by the Cabinet Secretary. Now, the Cabinet Secretary even now without this core group, heads a committee of colleagues from relevant Ministries and the the Service Chiefs to review the recommendations from the Defence in various matters be for

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

bring them to the Cabinet for the purpose of the decisions. This is already existing. I see little as to how this Strategic Core Group, which is expected to be chaired by the Cabinet Secretary and comprising of the representatives of three Services along with representatives of the Ministries is defferent in any form as compared to the present working system.

The third organ which is sought to be set up is the Secretariat. As on today the position is that the Cabinet Secretariat has a military wing servicing the joint Chiefs of Staff Committee. The only thing that you are adding is a new Secretary, which is, in my view, a totally wasteful expenditure. The Cabinet Secretary is the head of the Administration. When he is presiding over the core group and also taking the decisions on the military wing, which is there in the Cabinet Secretariat, he takes the dely appointed with all the paraphernalia of the Secretariat, which, perhaps, is being conceived of, would do better work and feed the Cabinet Secretary much more effectively? Nothing has been said so far as so the document is concerned and the entire House and the nation fails to understand as to where we have failed. What are the shortcomings and what loopholes are sought to be plugged and improvement is suggested?

Now, equally, the last, the National Security Board...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): National Security Advisory Board.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Yes, the National Security Advisory Board. This is to evolve the national consensus and public awareness on strategic security issues. It is consisting of the Chief Ministers and MPs etc. etc. To me, this is in no way different as compared to the National Emergency Council yore. There used to be a National Emergency Council which was constituted of the same persons. How is it different? I find there is no difference whatsoever. We seem to be undertaking a little theatrical approach and sending wrong signals to the various neighbouring countries and equally to the people of this country and are indulging in unnecessary expenditure. That is why I would like to bring this to your kind notice. In no country in the world a National Security Council exists, except in the United States of America. The United States of America had set up the National Security Council in 1947 when it was thinking in terms of acting as the interational policeman. It had a hegemonistic role. It was contemplating in terms of a global perspective of its defence strategy. It was a country which was highly resourceful and its system is of the Executive president. It is the Executive President who heads that country and there the National Security Council works as part of the President's executive office and not as a Secretariat. One most important feature that has to be borne in mind is the separation of powers which makes the Congress far more powerful and active in security matters than the President himself. Therefore, there is a balancing effect. Here with us the situation seems to be, which I will presently refer, a total bureaucratic set-up which feeds the National Security Council. There is no alternative. There is no alternative of a Parliamentary Committee at least so that there could be a proper interaction, proper feeding to the National Security Council itself.

The situation in the USA and the French Defence Council is, as you are very well aware, Mr. Prime Minister, the Secretary of Defence,

Finance, Secretary of State and the Home Affairs and the Director of CIA and also the Chief of Staff, are the members in the National Security Council. If the Chief of Staff or if you would like to have the Chief of the Intelligence Bureau whoever might be, if you would like to call them at any moment, they can be called. That is where the United States had been playing its global role taking into consideration the geo-political transformational stiuctures, transformation that has been taking place in the entire world. They have kept the world in view and set up the National Security Council in 1947. But the USSR does not have any National Security Council and their defence strategy which they face more or less single-handed against the hegemonistic power of the United States of America, had been super. At no point of time, the Soviet Union's defence strategy has ever failed. If you kindly look up, in spite of the resources of the National Security Council in the United States— let us just go into its record— perceptive writers have often said that they have not been able to anticipate the Korean war—they have not been able to anticipate the Berlin. Wall—they have not been able to anticipate even the current change in the eastern Europe—they have not even been able to anticipate the missile crisis in Cuba. Mr. Anderson's papers are any indication, they have not even been able to anticipate the Indo-Pak war of 1971 itself. Now, If this be the state of affairs of the National Security Council of the United States with all its resources at its command, where do we stand? What are our ambitions? Unfortunately rumours go round. I would like the hon. Prime Minister very much to clear the mist. Unfortunately the rumour goes round that perhaps, there is an advice or pressure from the United States that we should constitute National Security Council so that the deliberations, discussions and the matters that we undertake are available to them in one form or another...

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): That is an old cliche.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: May be old but it becomes new in the context of the action that you have taken. Are we aping the United States? If we are aping USA, with what purpose? The United States had to think of the Council in different circumstances altogether. Even then it has failed, as I submitted. But why are you thinking like that and where we have failed? You should have taken the national into confidence that here we have failed; that is why, we would like to think in terms of a better apparatus. That part of it has not been gone on and that creates more problems. I would like to bring to your notice that one could have thought of a statutory body, then perhaps one could have thought all right, you are bringing in the details, taking the nation into confidence and a holistic approach you would like to take. But there is nothing of that type. It is a duplicate CCPA. You could have strengthened the CCPA itself if you so wanted. It could have served a much better purpose and as I said, without a Parliamentary Committee, the entire feeding will be only through the bureaucratic channel and this will create more problems because your vision of approaching the issue would be too narow. You will not be able to have the views other than the bureaucratic views which in the context of stratgeic matters of defence are highly dangerous. I would like to just bring to your notice two factors which have troubled me. I do not know what advice was given. Constitutionally I find it hard to digest this resolution itself. This is clearly violative in terms of article 77, clause (1), (2) and (3) all. In terms of clause 77, all executive actions of the Government of India shall be expressed to be taken in the name of the President and under clause (2) of article 77, the authentication has to be effected in

[Shri P. Shiv Shanker]

terms as it has been laid in that particular clause. This resolution does not express itself in any form in the name of the Pesident. It has to necessarily express itself. All executive actions have to flow through this channel; that is the constitutional mandate. And we find, at the end of the resolution, the Cabinet Secretary signs it and orders that a copy of the resolution be communicated to all the Ministries, departments of the Government of India and all the State Governments and the Union Territories. The order also says that the resolution be published in the gazette of India for general information This is a simple waste paper. Constitutionally, it is nothing. It is neither expressed in the name of the President nor the authentication is in the form in which it ought to have been done. Equally, Mr. Prime Minister, all of us are aware that the entire distribution of work of the Government is under the business rules. I am not sure but I would like to get an enlightenment from you in terms of article 77(3). The President makes rules for the convenient transaction of the business of the Government of India and for the allocation among the Ministers of the said business. I do not know whether the business rule has been made. To my knowledge, whaever enquiries I tried to make—not of course, through your officials, but my own sources—they reveal that no business rules, whatsoever have been made in this respect. Business rules have not even been amended. If that be so, the situation is much worse legally and constitutionally. This resolution is worth mere paper. It does not have any mandate whatsoever for the purpose of saving that it is legal. I would like to submit that if you kindly look to paragraph 7, where the Prime Minister is entitled to appoint by himself the task force as the Chairman, one fears that this Secretariat, which will be wholly under the Prime Minister, might appoint and the apparatus that is likely to develop, it is possible... that in the hands of the Prime Minister it becomes a powerful organisation by itself. As a result, this defeats the collective resposibility of the Cabinet, and it is possible that the more the Prime Minister is powerful, the more his colleagues will cave in and in the circumstances, the collective responsibility of the Cabinet becomes a total farce. I would not like to take more time. My colleagues would be speaking. I submit that you may kindly consider the wisdom of going ahead with the National Security Council in the context of what has been said. Thank you very much.

उपसभापति : श्री मोहम्मद खलीलुर रहमान : आपकी पार्टी के छह मिनट हैं, आप छह मिनट में बोल लीजिएगा ।

श्री मोहम्मद खलीलुर रहमान (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) : मैडम, मैं मेरी तरफ से और मेरी पार्टी की तेलुगू-देशम की तरफ से यह जो रेजोलूशन लाया गया है, जिसके जरिए नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल का क्याम अमल में लाया जा रहा है, उसका खैर-मकदम करूगा और इसके लिए मैं वजीरे-आजम को मुबारकबाद दूंगा कि उन्होंने आजादी के बाद से पहली दफा इस किस्म का एक रेजोलूशन लाया । इसकी बेहद जरुरत थी । जैसा कि कहा गया है कि इंटरनेशनल और फिर नेशनल स्तर पर जो इन्तिहाई तेजी के साथ सूरते-हाल बदल रही है, इसके लिए यह बेहद जरुरी है कि यहां पर इस किस्म की एक कौंसिल कायम की जाय । इस कौंसिल में खुद हमारे मुल्क के वजीरे-आजम चेयरमेन होंगे, इससे हटकर फिर यहां के मिनिस्टर आफ डिफेन्स, होम-मिनिस्टर, फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर और एक्सटर्नल अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर उसके अराकीन बनाए गए हैं । इसके अलावा इसमें यह भी कहा गया है कि जब कभी भी जरुरत पड़े तो साइंटिस्ट और एक्सपर्ट को भी इसमें बुलाया जा सकता है ।

मैडम, दूसरी एक खास चीज और बड़ी खूबी इस बात की है कि यह नेशनल सिक्योरिटी एडवायजरी बोर्ड का क्याम भी अमल में लाया जा रहा है । इस नेशनल सिक्योरिटी एडवायजरी बोर्ड के जो अराधीन रहेंगे, उसमें मिनिस्टर को भी लिया जाएगा, मेम्बर्स आफ पार्लियामेंट को भी लिया जाएगा, माहिरे तालीम, साइंटिस्ट और जिंदगी के दूसरे शोबों से ताल्लुक रखने वाले जो एक्सपर्ट हैं, उनको भी लिया जाएगा । इसी के साथ एक और बड़ी सबसे खूबी यह है कि स्ट्रेटिजिक कोर ग्रुप का क्याम भी अमल में लाया जा रहा है, जिसमें तीन सर्विसेज के जो चीफ हैं, वे रहेंगे और इसके चेयरमैन केबिनेट सेक्रेटरी रहेंगे । जब इतने आला सतह पर एक नया सिस्टम कायम किया जा रहा है तो इसका खैर-मकदम करना चाहिए । इस वक्त मुल्क को, एक तो जो बेरूनी ताकते हैं, उनसे खतरा हो सकता है और फिर हम देख रहे हैं कि मुल्क की जो अंदरूनी सूरते-हाल है, टेरारिज्म का खतरा है यानी हमारी सरहदों पर एक तो बैरूनी ताकतों का खतरा है, फिर टेरारिज्म का खतरा भी हम देख रहे हैं कुछ शुमाल में, कुछ जुनूब में । इस वक्त जो नक्सलाइट की प्रोब्लम है, वह भी खतरा है । इसके लिए यह जरुरी है कि एक आवामी राय-आम्मा को बेदार किया जाय, फिर आवामी राय-आम्मा के कीमती मशविरे लिए जाय और उन मशविरों की बिना पर यह नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल रहेगी और यह फैसले करेगी कि किस तरह से हम मुल्क की बेहतर स्ट्रेटजी बना सकते हैं और क्या पालिसी हम बना सकते हैं । यह बेहद जरुरी है । इस लिहाज से मैं यह समझता हूं कि यह जो एकदाम किया जा रहा है, एक नया एकदाम है, एक एक्स-पेरीमेंट के तौर पर यह जरुरी है । लिहाजा, अभी जो ऑपोजीशन की तरफ से लीडर आफ दी ऑपोजीशन ने कहा कि 20 परसेंट एक्सपेंडीचर को जहां एक तरफ कम किया जा रहा है... तो फिर दूसरी तरफ यह नई पार्टी का क्याम अमल में लाया जा रहा है । मैं समझता हूं कि यकीनन 20 परसेंट एक्सपेंडिचर को कम करने के माने यह नहीं है कि कोई नई स्कीम शुरु न की जाए । नई स्कीम अगर मुल्क के मफाद में जरुरी है तो हम वह स्कीम शुरु कर सकते हैं ।

दूसरी बात खुद इससे जाहिर होती है कि अगर हुकुमत यह चाहती या वजीरे आज़म यह चाहते तो बगैर इसको पार्लियामेंट में लाए या पार्लियामेंट में बगैर मश्विरा किए भी यह बनाई जा सकती थी । खुद पार्लियामेंट में लाना, सामने रखना और पार्लियामेंट के अराकीन से मश्विरा करना खुद यह जाहिर करता है कि कितने डेमोक्रेटिक अंदाज में यह हुकुमत काम कर रही है । लिहाज़ा, मैं यह जो नेशनल सिक्युरिटी कांऊसिल कायम की जा रही है इसका खैर मकद्दम करता हूं और पूरी तवक्को करता हूं हमारे अपोजीशन के बेंचिज़ से और उनके अराकीन से भी कि वे इंतहाई संजीदगी के साथ जो मुल्क को बैरूनी और अंदरूनी खतरात हैं, उनको सामने रखते हुए आप इसकी ताइद करे ताकि एक अच्छे और मुत्तफेका माहौल में यह मसला हल हो जाए और नेशनल सिक्युरिटी कांऊसिल जिन अगराजो-मकासिद या एम्स और ऑब्जेक्टस के तहत बनाई जा रही है, उसकी तामील हो सके ।

†[شری محسن خلیل الرحمان

(آندھرا پردیش) : میڈم میری طرف سے اور میری پارٹی تیلگودیشم پارٹی کی طرف سے یہ رزولوشن لایا گیا ہے جسکے ذریعے نیشنل سکیورٹی کا قیام عمل میں لایا جا رہا ہے - اس کا خیر مقدم کرونگا اور وزیر اعظم کو مبارکباد دونگا کہ انہوں نے آزادی کے

†[]Transliteration in Arabic Script.

کے ساتھ ایک اور سب سے بڑی خوبی یہ ہے کہ (اسٹرے ٹیجک کور) گروپ کا قیام بھی عمل میں لایا جا رہا ہے - جسمیں تین سروسیز کے چیف ہونگے- وہ رہینگے- اور اسکے چیرمین کیبنیٹ سکریٹری رہینگے - جب اتنے اعلی پیمانہ پر ایک نیا سیسٹم قائم کیا جا رہا ہے تو اسکا خیر مقدم کرنا چاہئے - اس وقت ملک کو ایک تو جو بیرونی طاقتیں ہیں ان سے خطرہ ہوسکتا ہے - اور پھر ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کہ ملک کی جو اندرونی صورت حال ہے ٹیروریزم کا خطرہ ہے یعنی ہماری سرحدوں پر ایک تو بیرونی طاقتوں کا خطرہ ہے پھر ٹیروریزم کا خطرہ بھی ہم دیکھ رہے ہیں کچھ شمال میں کچھ جنوب میں اس وقت جو نکسلائٹ کی پرابلم ہے - وہ بھی خطرہ ہے - اسکے لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ ایک عوامی رائے عامہ کو بیدار کیا جائے - پھر عوامی رائے عامہ کے قیمتی مشورے لئے جائیں- اور ان مشوروں کی بنا پر نیشنل سکیورٹی کونسل رہے گی اور فیصلے کرے گی کہ کس طرح سے ہم ملک کی بہتر اسٹرے ٹیجی بنا سکتے ہیں اور کیا پالیسی ہم بنا سکتے ہیں - یہ بیحد ضروری ہے اس لحاظ سے میں یہ سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہ جو اقدام کیا جا رہا ہے - ایک نیا اقدام ہے - ایک ایکسپریمنٹ کے طور

[شری محمد خلیل الرحمان]

بعد پہلی دفعہ اس قسم کا ایک رزولوشن لایا گیا - اسکی بیحد ضرورت تھی - جیسا کہ کہا گیا ہے کہ انٹرنیشنل اور پھر نیشنل سطح پر جو انتہائی تیزی کے ساتھ صورتحال بدل رہی ہے اس کیلئے یہ بیحد ضروری ہے کہ یہاں پر اس قسم کی ایک کونسل قائم کی جائے - اس کونسل میں خود ہمارے ملک کے وزیر اعظم چیرمین ہونگے - اس سے ہٹ کر پھر یہاں کے منسٹر آف ڈیفینس - ہوم منسٹر - فائینینس منسٹر اور ایکسٹرنل افیئرز منسٹر اسکے اراکین بنائے گئے ہیں - اسکے علاوہ اسمیں یہ بھی کہا گیا ہے کہ جب کبھی بھی ضرورت پڑے تو سائنٹیسٹ اور ایکسپرٹ کو بھی اسمیں بلایا جا سکتا ہے -

میڈم - دوسری ایک خاص چیز اور بڑی خوبی اس بات کی ہے کہ یہ نیشنل سکیورٹی ایڈوائزری بورڈ کا قیام بھی عمل میں لایا جا رہا ہے- اس نیشنل سکیورٹی ایڈوائزری بورڈ کے جو اراکین ہونگے - اسمیں منسٹر کو بھی لیا جائیگا - ممبر آف پارلیمنٹ کو بھی لیا جائیگا - ماہر تعلیم اور زندگی کے دوسرے شعبوں سے تعلق رکھنے والے جو ایکسپرٹس ہیں ان کو بھی لیا جائیگا - اسی

[ ] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

پر ضروری ہے - لہذا ابھی جو اپوزیشن کی طرف سے لیڈر آف دی اپوزیشن نے کہا کہ ۲۰ پرسینٹ ایکسپینڈیچر کو جہاں ایک طرف کم کیا جارہا ہے - تو پھر دوسری طرف یہ نئی پارٹی کا قیام عمل میں لایا جارہا ہے - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یقیناً ۲۰ پرسینٹ ایکسپینڈیچر کو کم کرنے کے معنی یہ نہیں ہیں کہ کوئی نئی اسکیم شروع نہ کی جائے - نئی اسکیم اگر ملک کے مفاد میں ضروری ہے تو وہ ہم شروع کرسکتے ہیں -

دوسری بات خود اس سے ظاہر ہوتی ہے کہ اگر حکومت یہ چاہتی یا وزیر اعظم یہ چاہتے تو بغیر اسکو پارلیمنٹ کے اراکین سے مشورہ کرنا خود ظاہر کرتا ہے کہ کتنے ڈیموکریٹک انداز میں یہ حکومت کام کررہی ہے - لہذا میں یہ جو نیشنل سکیورٹی کاؤنسل قائم کی جارہی ہے اسکا خیر مقدم کرتا ہوں اور پوری توقع کرتا ہوں ہمارے اپوزیشن کے بینچیز سے اور انکے اراکین سے بھی کہ وہ انتہائی سنجیدگی کے ساتھ جو ملک کو بیرونی اور اندرونی خطرات ہیں انکو سامنے رکھتے ہوئے آپ اسکی تائید کرینگے - تاکہ ایک اچھے اور متفقہ ماحول میں یہ مسئلہ حل ہو جائے - اور نیشنل سکیورٹی کاؤنسل جن اغراض و مقاصد کے تحت یا ایس اور آبجیکٹس کے تحت بنائی جارہی ہے اسکی تعمیل ہوسکے -]

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am inclined to take this Resolution on its face value. So the seriousness which the Government has sought to convery through this Resolution I take it on its face value, and having taken so, and when one of the broad subjects to be covered by the National Security Council is of evolving a national consensus on strategic and security issues, I do not understand what necessitated the Government to set up a National Security Council and then come to Parliament instead of evolving a consensus on the formation of a National Security Council, as such. And this, in fact, was a mistake. If that seriousness which has been said to be conveyed through this Resolution for which a National Security Council is needed to be set up with the purpose, among other things, to evolve a consensus, national consensus, on strategic and security issues, then obviously the Government should have taken at least the political parties which are represented in Parliament of India into confidence..

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): Quite correct.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Before setting up the Council.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Kernataka): At least the supporting parties.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: You need not prompt me. I am quite capable of expressing my views. Madam, I do not think

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

that this was necessary at least the haste in which it was set up and the Resolution was framed and laid on the Table, was necessary and before that the Government could have taken the political parties represented in the Parliament of India into confidence if at all such a situation has arisen where a National Security Council with such a perspective was necessary. Ours is a parliamentary democracy and we are having a Cabinet form of Government, a Cabinet system of Government. I do not know somehow or other it also puts me into a quandary as to whether it foretells of the things to come, because we are having a parliamentary democracy, we are having a Cabinet system of Government, and yet, we require this type of a council to be set up. The other day the Prime Minister said that it will not supersede the CCPA or it will not usurp the power or jurisdiction of the CCPA or the Cabinet, for that matter. So, obviously it does not supersede any power or jurisdiction of the CCPA and if it works as a subordinate to the CCPA, then the question arises as to what the necessity was for such a council in a Cabinet system of Government. So, we are entitled to know, at least as a Member of Parliament representing a political party in Parliament I am entitled to know, not simply through the words which have been used in this resolution. Thirdly, I agree 100 per cent with the Prime Minister on one particular sentence: "Economic considerations are increasingly determining international political dynamics, and economic power is now more significant than military strength." If this sentence is read with one of the subjects to be considered by the National Security Council in sub-para (g) of paragraph 4 which says, "external economic threats in areas such as energy, commerce, food and finance,", I underline "commerce", when there is an external threat, an economic threat, in areas, among other things, of commerce, and with the perception that economic considerations are increasingly determining international political dynamics and economic power is now more significant than military strength, if it, among other things, necessitates the constitution of a National Security Council with a holistic approach, then, how do you explain your import-export policy, how do you explain your industrial policy? The import-export policy, which your Government has enunciated, the industrial policy which your Government has enunciated, by these two policies you have opened up our commerce and industry to the hegemonistic, imperialist, forces which want to capture the market and through economic threats, endanger the sovereignity and independence of countries like ours. How does this Government explain the invitation of PEPSICO in Punjab knowing fully well that this PEPSICO was the front of the CIA to destabilise Chile, and particularly in an area like Punjab where there is really a threat to the unity and integrity of our country? So, on the one hand, you are opening up your commerce and industry to the multinationals, to the Western multinationals, dominated by the US, even in the fields like electronics, high technology, defence production, etc., and, on the other, you are thinking of having a holistic approach to the question of national security in the background of economic threats in respect of energy, commerce, food

5.00 P.M.

and finance. That is why I say that I am inclined to accept this Resolution on its face value, and if we accept it on its face value, then I would like the Prime Minister to take initiatives in changing our economic policies, industrial policy and, more particularly, our import-export policy.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE (Maharashtra): If you take it on its face value, then do you think that there is a need for this?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: That is why I have said that if I have to accept it on its face value, it requires a revision in our industrial policy, in our export-import policy.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Not in this?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Not in this, because, if you accept this, revision is necessary in the other things and if you take the other things, this is not necessary. That is why I said that I accept it on its face value and having accepted it like that, I would now request the Prime Minister to take initiatives in changing the industrial policy and our export-import policy. I am not accepting your proposition, Mr. Salve, because you may like the industrial policy and the export-import policy because that is the carry-over of the policies of your Government.

PROF. CHANDRESH P. THAKUR (Bihar): Which one are you supporting?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I do not want to enter into that conundrum of which is earlier, the night or the day. You are a professor and you may reply to that. Anyway, what I would like to say is that this is what struck me. In fact, I agree with the perception, as he has stated in the Resolution, that economic considerations are increasingly determining international political dynamics and economic power is now more significant than military strength. Therefore, we must be very careful about the economic power of the hegemonistic and imperialist countries like the US. And you are also aware of all these things because you had been the Commerce Minister, you had been the Finance Minister, you had been the Defence Minister and now you have become the Prime Minister. So, you must be aware of all these aspects, of how the security, integrity, unity, sovereignty and independence of a newly indepnedent country or a developing country are being threatened by the imperialist forces. You are aware of their mechanisms also and that is why I say that your perception has grown out of that awareness which has found an expression in this Resolution in relation to economic factors, external economic threats in areas such as energy, commerce, food and finance.

Here I would lie to ask one question. If our Government is really aware of these threats, then what steps does the Government propose to take with regard to the import-export policy which it has enunciated, the industrial policy which it has enunciated? Is this the way of facing the threat? These are the ways of inviting threats or creating a situation in which the threats would become a reality.

So that is why....*(Time Bell rings)* I am going to conclue.

That is why if the situation which has been envisaged in the Resolution which has necessitated the Government to set up this Council, if I take it on its face value, it requires a change of export-import policy and also the new industrial pilicy.

Madam, I would say that the creationn of this National Security Council is simply a multiplicity of agencies in a parliamentary democracy, in a Cabinet system of Government Mr. Shiv Shanker has pointed out various angles. I am not going to repeat.

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

But I think before setting up this Council and making it a *fait accompli* before us, the political parties represented in Parliament should have been taken into confidence and in that case a national consensus would have emerged.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri N. K. P. Salve. Salve Sahib...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I will be very brief. Before you tell me, I will be very brief.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Because I have two other names.

SHRI N.K.P. SALVE: I will be very brief, because the Leader of the Opposition has very ably presented all our apprehensions, all our fears, all our doubts about all that is sought to be set up under these documents under this Resolution. And we have no doubt in our mind that the various institutions, if I may call them as sought to be set up, are not only ill-conceived, not only unwarranted but in fact very truly dangerous.

As I was reading the Resolution, the document of the Prime Minister, I was really shocked, I was stunned. For a moment I thought that the whole Constitution appears to have been re-written. What was sought to be created by this document, by this Resolution, was a monster of super Cabinet, an utterly extra-constitutional authority. Then the Prime Minister, fortunately, jumped on to the other end of the pendulum and said that this was to be a sub-committee of the CCPA. The enormity of the powers and the plentitude of the responsibilities which have been conferred on the various institutions sought to be created by these documents makes one wonder that if it is going to be a sub-committee of the CCPA, is it really necessary? This question Mr. Dipen Ghosh asked. Where is the warrant? What is the justification? Has this Government lost its own confidence, its own trust in the sanctity of its own foreign policy? Has it lost faith in its own perceptions of the economic and military situations from the point of view of India's welfare? Has it no faith left in its own valuation of the external geo-strategic environment? Are they no longer sure about their own plan to organize internal security and to ensure law and order in the country? Are they no longer assured of their own schemes and ideas as to how they would exercise their own authority as a Government to the largest democracy, not a banana republic, to ensure that the nation's integrity and sovereignty is not imperilled? And if they have not lost the confidence, if they have not lost the faith in themselves, I really do not understand why these high-sounding documents have been presented to the House like this?

I read their election manifesto. But this must have been something so insignificant, so trivial, I must have thought. But I never realised that it would come in this form. And if it has come in this form, Madam, I want to submit to the Prime Minister that if it is to be taken on its face value, the Resolution and the various things correctly stated, this is not a way out. By setting up the National Security Council, by setting up the National Security Advisory Board, and by setting up the strategic core group and task force, you are going to achieve nothing so far as the various problems which you have enunciated in your Resolution are concerned. What is necessary is a different approach—totally. Look at this, Madam. We are told that the National Security Council has to consider all aspects of national security. I particularly emphase the words "all aspects". All aspects means that nothing is left out. If nothing is to be left out of the National Security Council, then there is hardly any information, however

sensitive, however, secret, which can be withheld from the Security Council. If it is to be withheld, then they can't go into all aspects of the matter. If the Strategic Core Group which will be headed by the Cabinet Secretary and the three Chiefs of the Defences, is to withhold some information, then I have no doubt whatsoever in my mind that the National Security Council will not be able to consider all the aspects. Then it is supposed to take an overall view of the national security issues in the light of external, economic, political and military situations. Madam, there are such devastating responsibilities and such onerous and cumbersome responsibilities and such delicate responsibilities cast on the National Security Council that unless you are going to feed it fully and properly, it cannot discharge those responsibilities. I fail to understand the necessity of having it. As pointed out by Mr. Dipen Ghosh. Are you going to have it purely as a drama? Is it purely theatric? What is it that you are going to have it for? There is no purpose which it is going to serve. In fact, look at the message that is being sent. Shiv Shankerji has pointed out in great detail the grave dangers of the message this kind of a set-up is likely to send. Madam, there are as many as 9 subjects which the Security Council is supposed to deal with. It has to evolve an integrated approach to policy as it affects the national security. There are 9 subjects mentioned. These subjects are dealt with by Defence Ministry, by Home Ministry, by Human Resource Development Ministry and by Finance Ministry and I do not know how many other Ministries. What are the rules of business, as he very right pointed out? How will they be dealing with this kind of a thing? Either the whole thing is a plenty of barren verbiage without a sense of sincerity or maturity about it or if it to be sincerely met, I really don't understand how they are really going to work in a situation like this. Has the existing system failed already? Are you not able to cope up with the situation? Do you feel that your failures in Punjab or Kashmir or North-Eastern States or elsewhere to maintain law and order situation or your failure to curb the price rise and the deterioration economic situation has so divested you of your own confidence that you are in search of some props or you are in search of simeone to pass the buck on? If that is not so, all this is wholly unnecessary and unwarranted. Some of the things that have been stated might be true. But, Mr. Prime Minister, you have been elected by the whole country. You have your own Cabinet. You have your own selected people. They are there to advise you and to help you. And should you really need any expert advice, is there dearth of expert advice in the Government itself? Is our Army, is our Air Force, is our Navy so devoid of leadership that you are not able to depend on them? So far as what you call geo-strategic position is concerned. are you not able to get proper guidance from them? Geo-politics, you can depend on them. You have very able men. Two of the able men are sitting in your own Ministry. Are they worth nothing to you? They are not anywhere here in the Cabinet. I mean Dr. M. G. K. Menon and Dr. Ramanna. They are people of international eminence and repute. You have taken them in your Cabinet. Are they worth nothing to you? You must find people from outside to come and help you and they must be invested with all the powers and they must be given all the information. Please don't do it. For God's sake, don't do it. Whatever you are doing, for worse or for better, kindly do it yourself and with the help of your Government and your Cabinet. You have absolute and untrammelled authority to choose your own people. You have further untrammelled authority to take such help and such assistance as you would like to have.

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

A point which I cannot under-emphasise, was raised by Mr. Shiv Shanker. What is the legal sanctity of this Council that you are creating? By what authority will you be trusting these people with the very sensitive information and the secrets of the State that you will be imparting to them? What is written here as one of the subjects is that they will be dealing with other security threats, especially those involving atomic energy, space and high technology. When we ask questions about it, when Mr. Rajiv Gandhi was the Prime Minister, he would just keep quiet about it. He would not answer many of the questions. Perhaps you would not be answering many of the questions on this to your own colleagues. It is a trust of the nation reposed in you, Mr. Prime Minister. If you want this sort of a set-up to come up to help you in all the aspects of national security, perhaps in fairness to them you will have part with some of the information for which you will regret and for which the nation will never forgive you. One more aspect and I am done.

Madam, what is stated here? Mr. Shiv Shanker has very briefly referred to it. You want to create public awareness on important national security problem. Don't you have a mechanism? Don't you have a Press Advisor? Don't you have the electronic media for yourself? Don't you have the press media at your beck and call? Don't you have confidence in yourself that you can handle this much better than anyone else? If you have not handled it so well as you have done, you would not have been sitting there as the Prime Minister today. You will not find anyone better than yourself to handle this. Handle this yourself. Don't trust anybody else. Take any of your colleagues if necessary in the matter. Mr. Upendra is doing very well, censoring things against another Minister. He is there to help you. And the other Minister who is ridiculing the whole Cabinet is there to help you. If you want to create this sort of awareness with the help of these counsels, I must submit, we expect a first-rate authority, but falling back upon the tenth-rate authority. What are they supposed to know about the public awareness? About these two distinguished men, I talked of, I can debate on them for their technical knowledge. But if I were to depend on them for the purpose of bringing about public awareness in the important national security problem, it will be wrong persons entrusted with this task. Please do not do this. Please do not barter away the basic sovereignty of this Government. Please do not barter away your own rights. Please do not barter away the very sanctity of the Cabinet functioning. (*Interruption*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him make his point.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sardar Saheb, if you think that it is not bartering away, you are entitled to your own thinking. If you follow in depth, it is bartering away. It is bartering away if you want to allow them to look into all aspects relating to the country's security; all aspects of the country's security would involve necessarily. It is bartering away part of your own responsibility, part of your own right, Mr. Prime Minister. You will be letting down the country for reasons more than one. No. It is your own right to take it lightly, should you take it, Prime Minister. But we consider it a very serious matter. And in the interest of retaining this sanctity of the Constitution, the important provisions of the joint responsibility of the Cabinet, please abandon this idea. This is plenty of verbiage, tonnes of verbiage without an ounce of meaning into it

Thank you, Madam.

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (हरियाणा) : उपसभापति महोदया, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद के गठन पर इस सदन में यह अल्पकालिक चर्चा चल रही है। मैं अपने दल की

ओर से इस परिषद के गठन का स्वागत और समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ी हूं। मैंने विपक्ष के नेता माननीय श्री शिव शंकर जी की बात बहुत ध्यान से सुनी। अक्सर वे बहुत ही संयत भाषा में अपनी बात कहते हैं और उनकी अभिव्यक्ति की शैली भी बहुत ही प्रभावपूर्ण है। अक्सर उनके तर्क अकाट्य हुआ करते हैं लेकिन पता नहीं क्यों आज मुझे लग रहा था कि जैस श्री शिव शंकर जी मन से नहीं बोल रहे थे, उनके दल की नीति के नाते उन्हें इस परिषद के गठन का विरोध करना ही था, इसलिए एक अच्छे वकील के नाते उन्होंने कुछ तर्क गढ़े। उनके तर्कों की गहराई ..(व्यवधान) आपको लगा होगा, मुझे जो लगा वही बात मैं सदन के सामने रख रही हूं। आज पहली बार उनके तर्कों की गहराई मुझे छू नहीं पाई है। यह बात कहने का मुझे हक है और आज मैं सदन में कह रही हूं।

महोदया, यह राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद के गठन की घोषणा कोई अनायास नहीं हुई। पिछले 15 वर्षों में इस विषय पर बराबर चर्चा हुई है, सदन के बाहर हुई है और सदन के अन्दर हुई है, रक्षा मंत्रालय की सलाहकार समितियों में हुई है। जहां तक मुझे जानकारी है, राष्ट्रीय मोर्चा सरकार के सत्ता में आने के बाद जब राष्ट्रपति जी ने दोनों सदनों को सम्बोधित किया तो राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर चर्चा करते समय मेरी पार्टी के सदस्य श्री जसवंत सिंह जी ने जो लोक सभा के सदस्य हैं, उन्होंने यह मांग की थी कि राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद का गठन होना चाहिए और उसी समय माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह आश्वासन भी दिया था कि वे इस तरह के गठन का प्रस्ताव जरूर और जल्दी लाएंगे। आज उन्होंने एक बहुत बड़ी मांग को पूरा किया है, इस राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद के गठन के प्रस्ताव को लाकर। महोदया राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का मामला का अहम मसला है, महत्वपूर्ण मसला है, इस बात से तो कोई इंकार नहीं कर सकता है। मेरी दांई ओर बैठे हुए साथी भी नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन ये लोग इसे वोट का मुद्दा बनाकर चुनाव के मैदान में उतरे थे। राष्ट्र की एकता और अखंडता को बचाने के लिए कांग्रेस आई को वोट दो, यह कह कर ये चुनाव के मैदान में उतरे थे। हमारे लिए, महोदया राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का मुद्दा वोट का मुद्दा नहीं है। लेकिन हां, हमारे लिए यह मुद्दा निष्ठा का है, राष्ट्रीय संकल्प का है, यह हमारे लिए जीने का अर्थ है और मरने का मकसद है। महोदया, आज जो खतरा देश के ऊपर मंडरा रहा है, मुझे उसको जुबान देने की की जरूरत नहीं। पंजाब धूधू करके जल रहा है, कश्मीर झुलस रहा है, असम में अलगाववाद की आंधी तूफान का रूप लेकर भड़क रही है। पूर्वांचल के सात राज्यों में से कई राज्यों में विभिन्न गुट बगावत का झंडा उठाकर भूमिगत हो रहे है। ऐसे में भी अगर राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा परिषद की अनिवार्यता हमारे लोग महसूस नहीं करते तो मुझे आश्चर्य है। शिव शंकर जी इस बात को बहुत बल देकर कह रहे थे कि मौजूद व्यवस्था में क्या खामियां हैं, साजदा सिस्टम में कौन सी कमियां रह गई हैं, हमारे युद्ध संचालन में कहां कोई कमी रही है, जो इस सुरक्षा परिषद को बनाने की आवश्यकत महसूस हुई। दूसरी बात पर उतना ही बल देकर उन्होंने कहा कि जो मौजूद व्यवस्था चल रही है उसका स्वरूप और उसकी संरचना से इसका स्वरूप और इसकी संरचना भिन्न नहीं है, तो फिर इस की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी। और इनमें अंतर क्या है। अगर वे इस समय बैठे रहते तो अच्छा था। लेकिन मैं आपके माध्यम से उनको जवाब देना चाहती हूं। प्रधानमंत्री जी सदद में मौजूदा हैं वैसे तो वे स्वयं उनके तर्कों का प्रमुखता से जवाब देंगे। लेकिन इतन ही मैं कहना चाहती हूं। कि हां, स्वरूप और संरचना में ज्यादा अंतर नहीं है। लेकिन इसमें अंतर है तवज्जह का, अंतर है थ्रस्ट का। राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा के प्रश्न को जो तवज्जह और जो थ्रस्ट मौजूद व्यवस्था में मिलना चाहिए था, वह उसे नहीं मिल पा रहा

[श्री मती सुषमा स्वराज]

था। इसका कारण यह है कि सरकार का ज्यादा समय रोजमर्रा के राजकाल के संचालन में चला जाता है और सरकार के मंत्रियों को इतना समय नहीं मिलता कि वे इन मसलों का गहनता से अध्ययन करें और उनके बाद कोई रण-नीति बनायें। ब खामियों की बात करते हैं। यह ठीक है कि निर्णय हुए और उन निर्णयों के साथ भगवान ने हमारा साथ दिया, ईश्वर ने साथ दिया और उन निर्णयों की परिणति सफलता में हुई। लेकिन व निर्णय केवल खतरा होने के बाद तात्कालिक निर्णय के रूप में लिए गये। महोदय, अगर ऐसी संस्था पहले से मौजूद होती तो इन खतरों का पहले से अंदाज लगाया जा सकता था कि जैसे पंजाब में कभी उग्रवाद पनप सकता है। कश्मीर की बाबत तो गाहेबगाहे मेरी हा पार्टी के लोग कहते थ कि वहां पर इस तरह की नौबत एक दिन आयेगी। अगर इस तरह की कोई संस्था होती तो इस पर विचार-विमर्श करके कोई रणनीति तैयार कर सकती थी। आज खाड़ी के युद्ध ने तल का गहरा संकट पैदा करके हमारी सारी अर्थव्यवस्था को झकझोर दिया है अगर कोई एसी संस्था होती तो वह बैठकर इस पर विचार कर सकती थी कि अगर कभी मिडिल ईस्ट में इस तरह का युद्ध छिड़ गया तो हमारे यहां इस तरह की हालत पैदा होगी, हमारे यहां तल का संकट गहरायेगा और इस संकट से किस तरह उबरा जा सकता है। पाकिस्तान में बेनजीर भुट्टो को बरखास्त कर दिया गया। अगर हमारे यहां कोई एसी संस्था होती तो वह इस बात पर विचार कर लेती कि यदि कभी बनजीर भुट्टो को हटा दिया गया तो उसक क्य असर भारत की सुरक्षा पर पड़गा और एसी परिस्थिति से उबरने के लिए हमारे पास क्या उपाय होंगे। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूं कि खतरों का पूर्व अंदाजा लगाकर उन खतरों से निपटने की रणनीति तैयार करना क्या मूर्खता है, क्या अपरिपक्वता है? बल्कि इसे तो कुशल राज संचालन का परिचायक कहा जाना चाहिए। एक अच्छा राजा, एक अच्छे प्रजातांत्रिक देश का प्रधानमंत्री इस बात की व्यवस्था रखेगा ही कि कोई एसी संस्था हो जहां पर इस तरह के लोग बैठ हों, जिसमें अच्छे विशेषज्ञ हों और जो पहले से एसे खतरों का अंदाज लगा सकें जो आज हमारे सामने नहीं हैं। उल्फा का मूवमेंट असम में चल रहा है, कल यह क्या रूप धारण कर ले इस बात का अंदाजा आज बैठकर लगान चाहिए। मिजोरम की जानकारी मुझे है। वहां पर महार नाम का एक गुट अलग से बागी हो गया है। तीन साथ साथ के प्रदेशों में महार लोग रहते हैं। आज इस बात की जरूरत है कि तीनों सरकारें, मणीपुर की सरकार मिजोरम की सरकार और असम की सरकार मिलकर इस बारे में निर्णय लें कि इस महार आन्दोलन का किस तरह से सामना करना है। शायद तीनों को इकट्ठे आपरेशन करने की जरूरत पड़े। लेकिन आज कोई एसी संस्था मौजूद नहीं है। हां, गाहेबगाहे जब मीटिंगें होती है तो अपनी बात सभी कहते हैं और जो कुछ वहां कहा जाता है उस पर निर्णय ले लिया जाता है। लेकिन इस तरह से तात्कालिक निर्णय लिए जांय इससे कहीं बेहतर यह व्यवस्था होगी कि इसके लिए कोई ऐसी संस्था स्थायी तौर पर स्थापित हो। इसके नीचे चार चीजों का प्रावधान किया गया है। हमने कहा कि स्टेटिजिक कोर ग्रुप होग, हमने कहा इसमें एक एडवाइजरी बोर्ड होगा, हमने कहा इसमें टास्क फोर्स होगा। मगर मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आ रहा है कि इसमें ऐतराज की क्या बात है। एक सुरक्षा सलाहकार बोर्ड है, उसके कुछ सदस्य होंगे, अलग अलग जगहों से, अलग अलग क्षेत्रों से लिये हुये, जिनमें उनकी विशेषज्ञता होगी, वे लोग राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा से जुड़े हुये मसलों पर सुझाव देंगे। राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा के मुद्दे को हमें संकीर्ण दृष्टि से भी नहीं देखना है। शिव शंकर जी कह रहे थे कि बाहरी देशों से कौन सा खतरा है। आप जरा इसका कार्य क्षेत्र पढ़ कर ती देखिये। इसका कार्य क्षेत्र बहुत

व्यापक है । केवल बाहरी देशों से खतरों की बात नहीं है, आंतरिक खतरों की भी बात है। जहां तक आर्थिक दृष्टि से जो खतरे मंडरा रहे हैं उनकी भी बात है । सोशल ग्रुप्स की टेंशन से जो तनाव पैदा हुये जो खतरे हैं उनकी भी बात है। इसका कार्य क्षेत्र बहुत व्यापक है । देश की सुरक्षा का मतलब केवल सीमाओं पर लड़ने वाली फौजों से हल नहीं होता । यह तमाम के तमाम मसले देश की सुरक्षा से संबंधित मसले हैं, बावस्ता हैं। इनके ऊपर सुरक्षा सलाहकार बोर्ड के लोग अपनी सलाह रखेंगे । उसके बाद टास्क फोर्स बनाने की बात है। इससे बेहतर कोई प्रावधान नहीं हो सकता है। टास्क फोर्स के लिये कहा गया है कि हर किसी विशेष बात के लिये एक अलग से विशेषज्ञ दल गठित कर दिया जायेगा जो उससे बाबस्ता होंगे जो उस विषय के विशेषज्ञ होंगे और वह अध्ययन करके इसका एक प्रारूप तैयार करेंगे जो स्ट्रेटेजिक कोर ग्रुप के जरिये, नेशनल सिक्युरिटी काऊंसिल के सामने रखा जायेगा । एक बड़ा प्रमुख तर्क इसके विरोध में दिया जा रहा है कि यह सुरक्षा परिषद संसदीय जनतंत्र को हल्का कर देगी, पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी पर चोट पहुंचायेगी, काबिना प्रणाली को, निष्प्रभावी कर देगी, काबिना प्रणाली की जो जवाबदेही है वह कम हो जायेगी । मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता मैंने तो एक बार नहीं तीन बार पूरा दस्तावेज एसे लेकर जेड तक पढ़ डाला है कि कहीं कुछ मिल जाय जो इस संसदीय जनतंत्र पर चोट लगाने वाला हो लेकिन मुझे ऐसी कहीं कोई चीज नजर नहीं आई । जहां तक नेशनल सिक्युरिटी आऊंसिल का सवाल है, इसमें चार मंत्री इसी काबिना के रहेंगे और वह जो बात कहेंगे वह सी.सी.पी.ए. के सामने आयेगी । जहां तक स्ट्रेटेजिक कोर ग्रुप का सवाल है वैसी एक कमेटी आफ सेक्रेटरीज अभी भी मौजूद है। आपके यहां भी एक क्राइसेज मेनेजमेंट ग्रुप था । वह क्राइसेज मेनेजमेंट ग्रुप क्या था ? अगर आप कहते हैं यह वैसा ही स्वरूप है तो इसमें आपका विरोध होना ही नहीं चाहिये । लेकिन अन्तर है । अन्तर यह है कि क्राइसेज मेनेजमेंट ग्रुप क्राइसेज पैदा होने के बाद बैठता था कोई निर्णयलेने के लिये और यह जो स्ट्रेटेजिक कोर ग्रुप है और टास्क फोर्स है यह इस बात के लिये बैठेगी कि संकट आये ही ना और अगर संकट आ जाय तो उससे निपटने की पूर्व तैयारी करेगी। यह अन्तर है और कोई अन्तर नहीं है । स्वरूप और संरचना, अगर आप खुप मानते हैं कि वैसी ही है तो अगर वैसी है और उस स्वरूप और संरचना ने आज तक काबिना प्रणाली को निष्प्रभावी नहीं किया, संसदीय जनतंत्र को हल्का नहीं किया तो यह परिषद कहां से संसदीय जनतंत्र को हल्का कर देगी (समय की घंटी) उपसभापति महोदया, मैं जानती हूंकि समय बहुत कम है, इसके बाद बिजनेस बहुत ज्यादा है, मैं कोई लम्बी बात नहीं कहना चाहूंगी । लेकिन यह जरूर कहना चाहूंगी कि अगर ऐसी कोई संस्था पहले रही होती तो आज यह खतरे देश के सामने नहीं होते। आखिर ऐसी संस्था लाने का जो प्रस्ताव प्रधानमंत्री जी ला रहे हैं इस पर एतराज क्यों होना चाहिये ? अगर राजनैतिक दृष्टि से विरोध के लिये विरोध करना है तो यह कोई अच्छी परम्परा नहीं है। इसलिये मैं एक बात जरूर कहना चाहूंगी कि विपक्ष के साथियों से कि राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की दृष्टि से, राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा की दिशा में यह प्रथम चरण है, यह राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा का कोई आखिरी जवाब नहीं है, अंतिम उत्तर नहीं है । दिस इज दी फस्ट स्टेप। यह पहला चरण है । प्रधानमंत्री जी से मैं कहना चाहूंगी कि यह जो एडवाइजरी बोर्ड का प्रावधान आपने रखा है इसको कारगर बनाने के लिये आप इतना जरूर देखें कि यह अनविल्डी न हो जाये। आम तौर पर हमारे यहां एक प्रथा चल गई है । यह जो आपने परिषद् बनाई है इसमें फलां जिले का भी लिया जाये, फलां क्षेत्र का भी लिया जाये । ऐसा नहीं है, इसमें कोई रिप्रेजेंटेशन आफ पीपल का सवाल नहीं है। यह खास एक विशेष मद के लिये

[श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज]

बनाया गया बोर्ड है । इसकी संख्या 20–25 से ज्यादा नहीं होनी चाहिये । खास तौर पर इसी मसले से जुड़े हुये विशेषज्ञों को इस में रखें । दूसरी आपने कही है, कम से कम दो बैठकें होंगी । आम तौर पर यह देखा गया है कि जो कम से कम होता है वही नियम बन जाता है । तो दो ही बैठकें होंगी । ऐसा नहीं हो कि यह दो बैठकें रस्मी हो करके रह जायें । इसलिये हर तीन मास में कम से कम एक बैठक का मेंडेटरी प्रावधान होना चाहिये ताकि तीन मास के बाद सुरक्षा बोर्ड के लोग बैठें, अपनी बात कहें और फिर उसके बाद टास्क फोर्स के अलग अलग दल गठित हों और स्ट्रेटेजिक कोर ग्रुप के माध्यम से आपके पास नेशनल सिक्युरिटी काऊंसिल में यह मसले आयें । यह दो बातें थी जो मैं सुझाव के तौर पर कहना चाहती हूं । तीसरी बात मैं कहना चाहूंगी कि जिस संसदीय जनतंत्र के हल्का होने की तरफ इशारा किया जा रहा है आज तो दस्तावेज में ऐसा कुछ नहीं है लेकिन अगर कहीं इसकी कार्य प्रणाली से ऐसी कोई झलक होने लगी तो फिर हम लोग भी इसका समर्थन नहीं कर सकेंगे क्योंकि जहां तक संसदीय जनतंत्र का सवाल है उसके प्रति हमारी प्रतिबद्धता संपूर्ण है, कम्पलीट एंड टोटल । कोई भी ऐसी संस्था जो हमारी पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी को अंडर माइन करे ,जो हमारी सदन के प्रति जवाबदेही को कम करे उस में हम शिरकत नहीं कर सकेंगे । इसलिये इस की कार्य प्रणाली तय करते समय यह जरूर ध्यान रखा जाय कि देश के संसदीय जनतंत्र पर किसी तरह का कोई प्रहार न हो । इतना कहते हुये मैं इस सुरक्षा परिषद् के गठन का स्वागत करती हूं । और इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करती हूं ।

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you very much, Madam. The annousement of the Prime Minister to set up a National Security Council, on which we had a discussion the other day, has evoked a barrage of criticism, as is apparent from the speeches of many hon. Members here. I do not want to cover the same ground, but you might have noticed yourself that there has been criticism in political circles as also in the national press. Some people have denounced it as "super Cabinet", some say " it is old wine in a new bottle" and some say that it is a "Frankenstein's monster" which will take away the autonomy of other Ministries. I will not use such strong words, but as I said the other day, may I know from the Prime Minister specifically what are the deficiencies of the existing system and how the National Security Council will remove them? And why did successive Prime Ministers, during last 40 years did not approve of the idea, though it was discussed many times. And if the objective is to take a "holistic" view, was the hon. Prime Minister who was the Defence Minister himself, not taking a holistic view during his term? We had very eminent Defence Ministers, including Mr. V. P. Singh himself. Were they not taking a holistic or coordinated or long-term view?

I have limited time, so I will not develop the argument but touch only the main outlines. I hope you will not mind my not going in great details. I will not cover the ground which was covered by the Leader of the Opposition, that the composition of NSC is akin to CCPA. The Heads may change from time to time. The Prime Minister is all powerful. It is his prerogative to have anybody in the CCPA or in the Strategic Core Group. But our feeling is it is a parallel arrangement and, as the Prime Minister said the other day, if it is a sub-committee or a committee of the Cabinet like CCPA, what is the need of it? Why should we give it such a grandiose name as National Security Council and create a sensation particularly in Asia and in the neighbouring countries, and incur all this expenditure? When you have the same Core Group,

the same parallel machinery, why create all this? Why not call it a committee on Defence of the Cabinet.

Then, if I may point out, the subjects covered, the mandate given to the National Security Council is so wide-ranging and include not only patterns of alienation likely to emerge within the country, especially those with a social, communal or regional dimension—probably the reference is to Mandal Commission or communal riots—then external economic threats in areas such as energy, commerce, food and finance, but also threats posed by trans-border crimes such as smuggling and traffic in arms, drugs and narcotics etc . Madam, may I point out that it is too comprehensive and it is not practical to cover all this under it. This evokes the criticism that probably this NSC may be misused to amass and concentrate power in few hands. I am not talking of the present Prime Minister, but if it is going to be the arrangement, then any Prime Minister who becomes very powerful may use it to set up some sort of a parallel apparatus which may impede the constitutional provisions and also hamper the working of other Ministries.

A reference has been made to America. I will not go in great details. As the Leader of the Opposition said that it was formed in 1947 and it has been noticed that the Natioal Security Council of America has its own flaws. If you look at the records, you will find during the last 4 years, it has not made more than seven or eight times. It has functioned through committees and not through the pattern which has been given here.

And it has not been consulted in very important matters. Kennedy did not consult it while going to the Bay of Pigs for Cuba invasion, Johnson did not consult it and, during the Indo-Pakistan war it was not consulted. Kissinger did not consult it while laying down New China policy. There were things of that kind--and I will not go into them in great detail—but, in any case, the National Security Council of America has not proved a success. And if it is the source of inspiration to us, then we are going to be disappointed.

Madam, I may point out that what irks me and causes concern a little is the association of outsiders. Firstly, you give such a long list of subjects, very sensitive. With war clouds hovering over our borders and serious things happening in the Gulf with the crisis over there, we cannot refer in great detail to it. In the National Security Council you have provided for association of outsiders. If you invite them to the National Security Council, what about the security clearance? In the National Security Council you will discuss some of the most vital and secret defence matters. As I said the other day, even the Prime Minister will not share certain secrets with others. He does not tell us, in Parliament or even in the Consultative Committee of Parliament, and even in his own Cabinet he will not tell, certain top secret things. He is certainly entitled to it and he is very right because in certain sensitive matters he should not take anybody into confidence. Leave aside the Ministers, you are inviting outsiders to the National Security Council. They may be experts, very able people, but things are very different here. You cannot part with national secrets, particularly, Defence secrets. And in the Task Force also you will be having expert assistance from agencies which are outside the Government also. So, this is rather dangerous, the point which I have referred to.

Madam, I now come to the last point. I am grateful to you because you are not ringing the bell. You are evolving a national consensus on strategic and security issues. Well, Madam, the Prime Minister was used to say, in other forums also from time to time—I am associated

[Shri Kapil Verma]

with the Consultative Committee where these things were discussed but I am not free to refer to the discussions there—and even in his preliminary statements some four or six months ago, he said that on foreign policy and in the field of security also he would like to build a consensus. This is the stated policy and we welcomed it then. This is also part of security, one of the main organs of the main organs of security machinery. But he has produced the Resolution and presented us with a *fait accompli* without trying for a consensus with the various parties. This is rather strange. I would join Mr. Dipen Ghosh, Mr. Salve and other colleagues here and appeal to him that before enforcing this decision, before actually implementing this decision, he should call a meeting of the representatives of the various parties represented in Parliament, discuss everything with them, remove whatever doubts there are, amend it as far as possible and bring it—if it is at all necessary to bring it—in a shape which is acceptable to the entire nation, because such things are national institutions and above politics.

You have had some other innovations also. You had the Kashmir portfolio and gave it to particular Minister. Then you have had the Policy Groups in other Ministries—in External Affairs and other places—into which I will not go in great detail. But they failed. If you want to have an innovation, please have it but please discuss it with the various parties. It is your avowed policy to have a consensus on major issues. I don't think there can be an issue bigger than this. So, please call a meeting of the leaders of the various parties and arrive at a consensus. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Raj Mohan Gandhi. I would request all the subsequent Members to please abide by the time because we have to finish it.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Finish by?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: By 6.15, including the Prime Minister's reply...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAJ MOHAN GANDHI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam, when I was listening to the usually persuasive Leader of the Opposition, I said to myself, is this the eminent spokesman of the party that promised constructive cooperation? Is this one of the distinguished leaders of a party which ruled this country for several years? He wandered whether there was a great necessity for a new institution. Can we look at Kashmir and say to ourselves that we don't need something new and an additional effort? Can we look at Punjab and say to ourselves, look, there is no case for examining the possibility of a fresh approach? Can we look at Assam and deny the necessity for at least an examination of a new approach? Can we look at Andhra and say to ourselves that everything is satisfactory? That way that we have done things so far is enough? Can we look at Pakistan and the low intensity undeclared war now existing and say to ourselves, well, there is not a great need for something new? I am not saying that what is proposed is going to be a pauacea or a solution, but I would expect of hon. gentlemen and hon. ladies connected with a great political party at this hour in India's history to say: look, if the Government is bringing forth a new proposal, a new administrative tool, a new forum to collect information not to share information with everybody, all and sundry, this bogey of the security of the nation being endangered because experts' views are sought if the Government is coming forward with a new administrative tool, at least wish it well and give it a chance. I don't see what you lose. Even your own image in the country as a whole will

improve. At this hour in our country's life, in the environment we are placed in with the oil crunch, in this oil emergency, does not our Security Study require a new look? There is the narcotic terrorist nexus. Does that not require a close study? You may say, yes, all this can be done with the existing institutions. Well, there may be a case for that, but here please trust. I completely share hon. Sushma Ji's views. At this time in our nation's history, the Government has come forward with this proposal. Let us give it a fair chance. Of course, it has been said that it was not needed during Jawaharlal Ji's time, Indira Ji's time and so forth, but things have changed. 1990 is not 1970 or 1948. 1990 is 1990 and there is definitely a case. Ask the concerned citizen and he will tell you there is definitely a case for attempts to do things better and to do things differently.

It has been said that it is too wide-ranging. Yes, of course, it is. I do not expect the National Security Council within a few weeks to produce a comprehensive analysis of all these points. But surely there is a case for making a start. I think the Government's initiative in this will be welcomed and I am confident that despite what was said in the habit of criticising something because it comes from the Government, the House will extend its best wishes to this new institution that is sought to be created.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Gen. J. S. Aurora. You have only four minutes.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA (Punjab): Well, then I may say I vote for it and sit down.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I can't help it.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: This is one subject in which there should be a little more time for me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is my duty to inform.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: Well, Madam Chairperson, I rise to commend the Government for having thought about establishing the National Security Council. I would also like to say that as a Member of the Consultative Committee on Defence, we already have had two discussions on it. Therefore, I am surprised that there is still a great deal of resistance from the Opposition. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): This is becoming a habit in the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Natarajan, if he mentions about what was the discussion, I will stop him. He said that the discussion took place. He said only this much. Beyond that he is not going.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: That implies certain innuendoes. That is not correct.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please mind your words.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I leave the words... (*Interruptions*)... I have no objection.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: General, you might change your bullets or guns whichever you like.

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: All I can say is that the Leader of the Opposition pointed out "where have we failed?". My mind goes back to 1962 where we had utterly failed. Therefore, to say that we have not failed at all would be wrong.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: In 1970-71?

SARDAR JAGJIT SINGH AURORA: I am just coming to that. I want to say we did not come off so well in 1965 which we should have if we had worked out and had a National Security Council and worked in time what was required by us— how we were going to meet the pressure from the super powers. Even in 1971, we could have given a better account of ourselves on the Western front, if the strategic planning at the international level had been properly done. I would also say

[Sardar Jagjit Singh Aurora]

that we would not have suddenly decided to have a new Defence Minister when we were having the Operation Brass-tacks exercise, if we had a National Security Council which would have given this point a great deal of thought and also considered that changing horses in the midstream is something that gives an impression of weakness and not of strength. Therefore, there is no doubt in my mind that an organisation which can look at these problems as a whole, which is given the task of looking at such problem as a whole when required. That the CCPA is supreme is accepted but the CCPA has many other problems to deal with which can be of any nature and many of them are of a political nature, inter-party nature, intra-party nature also. But the job of the National Security Council is to look at the security aspect of the various problems that we have, in its entirety and in depth. That is why I feel that it is necessary for the National Security Council not only to exist by itself but also have a special machinery for it like the strategic core group to ensure that the papers that come up to it have been well considered and are put up for the final decision which can then be taken to CCPA for its approval.

I think this question of "don't give this informtaion to everybody, don't give this information on security is being over-emphasised." In USA apart from having the National Security Council, they have many other organisations which do strategic thinking, technical thinking on hi-tech, thinking on various aspects which impinge on the National Security Council. They are invited by the National Security Council and given these tasks. So the idea of having a task force is an excellent one and it should be appreciated. The impression that if you are giving the task force a task to do, you have to share with it every bit of information is incorrect. We only give the task force that much of information which has a security aspect, which will enable them to carry out their task. You don't have to share even the most secret aspect of the running of the Government or certain other things that you don't want them to know. I am inclined to feel that this impression that if we reorgainse ourselves and have the National Security Council, we are going to send wrong signals to Pakistan is wrong. When they want to reorganise their forces, I think, they reorganise them because they find that it is going to make them more efficient. We want to reorganise all these institutions, we want to see that we are in a position to deal with any problem that may come up again. Similarly, realising that various things have happened from which we must learn lessons and the lesson learnt is that we need another institution, another organisation which will enable us to deal with the security problems more efficiently and more effectively. There is no reason why we should not go ahead with it rather than saying that the Pakistanis' spine will be chilled. It won't do any harm to us if it is chilled. Now we talk about increasing expenditure. I am rather surprised that this question should have been raised, because if a thing is required to be done, certainly, the Government can find the resources and economy can be exercised in other areas which are not so vital. I have no doubt in my mind that like all Governments, this Govenrment is top-heavy. We are spending a lot of money which we should not and there is a need to go in for economy But I do not think that we want to correlate the economy with something which is vital for us and which we should really set about to ensure that we are in a better position to meet any threat that may come about and meet the threats which we already have. I think we have in the last few years let threats develop without taking adequate action to ensure how those threats can be suitably dealt with. I think Punjab has been permitted to go from bad to worse because no real thinking on it has been done. Proper thinking is not only how much force we are going to use but proper thinking is how we are going to solve this problem so that Punjab, which has always been a sword arm, will be available to us when any threat develops from across the border. We have done none of this and therefore to keep on saying what is it where we have failed is of no use. I think, the last Government failed on several counts and therefore, it is about time that we did change things. Thank you very much.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): I shall be very brief because brevity is the soul of wit. When one looks at this resolution and the statement, one finds it hazy, woolly, thoughtless, impracticable and porously platitudinous. I wish, I could share the confidence of my friends, Shrimati Sushmaji, Rajmohanji, and above all, General Auroraji that the National Security Council is something like a magic wand that if we had had it in our hands ten years earlier, there would not have been a problem of Punjab, there would not have been a problem of Kashmir, there would not have been a problem of Assam, there would have been no problem so far as oil crunch is concerned and everything... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are not answerable to him.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: I don't share that optimistic view. Well, much has been said and I find all that the hon. Prime Minister has done is only to change the format and especially 6.00 P.M.
two of his statements, day before yesterday, have really simplified the situation. Firstly, he says that this is not going to be a permanent body. So, to my friends who are so optimistic, "Please don't... (*Interruptions*).

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH): Permanence means that the Ministers of the previous Government will not be carried forward to the next one.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: Securing permanence to a body is well known. A Government resolution cannot secure that permanence because the moment the Government changes, like you change Governors, even the National Security Council will fall by the wayside. He knows very well that this National Security Council is temporary, short-lived, for the purpose of serving the present Prime Minister.

The second thing which he said was that it is going to work within our framework of the Cabinet system and under the Cabinet. Now, I do not want to get into this. But I do not understand it when the resolution states that there would be five Ministers. Now the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister is the Defence Minister. Along with him, the Foreign Minister, the Home Minister and one more Minister, the Finance Minister, will form the National Security Council. I cannot understand as to why they are going to do all this work and again will refer it to the CCPA which consists of only two more Ministers, namely the Commerce Minister and the Industries Minister. The message is very very clear that this National Security Council is meant to side-track the CCPA. I think it is very very dangerous. I do not want to say much on an occasion like this. But let us understand that our security vision will depend on our basic things, core things of our society. We are pledged to democracy we are pledged to the rule of law; we are pledged to a free and open society. India is not an expansionist country at all. The moment we liberated Bangladesh, we handed it over them. Not one territory has been occupied by India and we are the apostles and the leaders of peace. We are the leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement. We have to preserve this image. I somehow or other think that this image is not protected by an idea like this. I can only predict three things for this National Security Council's future. Firstly, it will end up as ornamental, useful only for fixing people with soft jobs. Secondly, it may fall by the wayside. And thirdly—I hope it will not come true—it will make so much of centralisation of power that it may become a Frankenstein which may devour a good part of our good system.

Last but not the least, today there are dark clouds on the horizon. Dangerous and divisive forces have been unleashed. At a time when the spirit of nationhood should transcend all differences, no National Security Council can help us unless we, as the citizens of this great motherland, resolve to stand firm and united. Dr. Ambedkar gave the message: 'Not by birth but by worth'. And I think the House will join me in making an appeal to the entire nation, to every citizen, to every child. Let us all resolve to work hard for our motherland and be worthy sons of this great nation and give

[Shri Murlidhar Chandrakant Bhandare]

her the pride position in the world which will ensure, of course, safety for the nation and peace for the world. Thank you.

उपसभापति : राम अवधेश जी, आप केवल दो मिनट में बोल दीजिए । I will request everybody to give him a patient and peaceful hearing.

श्री हरवेन्द्र सिंह हंसपाल (पंजाब) : भंडारे जी ने तो दो मिनट में खत्म कर दिया, अब देखते हैं कि यह करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभापति महोदया, यह राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे की सरकार द्वारा राष्ट्रीय सुरक्षा कौंसिल या परिषद् का जो प्रस्ताव किया गया है वह एक सराहनीय प्रस्ताव है और मैं समझता हूं कि इसका समर्थन बिना किसी संकोच के करना चाहिये । मुझे अफसोस लगता है कि प्रतिपक्ष समर्थन तो करता है लेकिन इस समय "परन्तु-किन्तु" की झड़ी लगाकर करता है, जबकि यह लगता है कि इस समय राष्ट्रीय मोर्चे की सरकार जो कदम उठा रही है, पिछले दो हफ्तों में उससे हर बार लगता है कि प्रतिपक्ष एक मोर्चा हार गया है ।

उपसभापति : अब आप अपने बिन्दु पर बोलिये । आप दूसरे मोर्चे की बात मत करिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : लगता है यह मोर्चा हारते जा रहे हैं, यह काम तो हमें करना चाहिये था ।

उपसभापति : हम लोग यहां नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल ..., (व्यवधान)

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : इनको लगता है कि यह काम हमारे जमाने में हुआ नहीं ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : प्लीज राम अवधेश जी हमारे आगे जो डिस्कशन हैं वह नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल पर है । किसी के मोर्चा हारने या जीतने की यहां पर चर्चा नहीं कर रहे हैं । इसलिये कृपया आप उसके ऊपर बोलिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : आप जो कह रही हैं वही मैं भी कह रहा हूं । आज इनका जो समर्थन होना चाहिये था बिना किसी "परन्तु किन्तु" के, उसको "परन्तु-किन्तु" की झड़ी लगाकर के समर्थन करते हैं । क्यों कर रहे हैं ? इसलिये कर रहे हैं, यह सोचते हैं कि यह काम हमें करना चाहिये था जो वह हमने किया नहीं और यह कह रहे हैं इसका इनको क्रैडिट जा रहा है । इनको तो कोई भी अच्छा काम हो जाने पर, कोई तो बढ़िया काम को एक बार कह दीजिये पूरे मन से कि ठीक है ।

उपसभापति : आप कह दीजिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : मैं तो कह ही रहा हूं ।

उपसभापति : आप अपनी बात करिये, आप क्या समर्थन दे रहे हैं या नहीं दे रहे हैं आप उसकी बात करिये । दूसरा क्या कर रहा है आप उसकी कोई चिंता मत करिये ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, जो शंकायें प्रतिपक्ष की ओर से उठायी गयी हैं तो मैं अपनी बात क्या कहूं । अपनी बात... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : देखिये आपका समय बेकार वेस्ट हो रहा है । मैं घंटी बजा रही हूं ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : जो शंकायें उठायी जा रही हैं वह निर्मूल हैं, क्योंकि जब कैबिनेट के चार मंत्री उसमें रहेंगे और जो एक्सपर्ट इस देश के अलग-अलग विभागों के उसमें रहेंगे तो जो कौंसिल बन रही है वह कौंसिल एक तरह से भारत सरकार को सुरक्षा के मामलों में, आन्तरिक सुरक्षा के मामलों में और बहारी सुरक्षा के मामलों में यहां तक कि जो इसमें सूची गिनायी गयी है इस प्रस्ताव

के जरिये वह एक लंबी सूची है, वह एक्सटर्नल मामले में और व्यापार के मामले में, कई तरह के मामले में सलाह देगी और सोच समझकर गहन अध्ययन के बाद जो सामने चीज ठोस रूप में रखेगी कि आवश्यकता पड़ने पर सरकार उससे काम ले सके, तो इसमें घबड़ाने की क्या जरूरत है ? इसमें पार्लियामेंट्री फार्म आफ गवर्नमेंट के पावर में कहां कटौती होती है ? जो आप लगातार कह रहे हैं कि यह संसदीय प्रणाली की सरकार पर एक तरह से एन्क्रोचमेंट है, यह कहां से करते हैं ? तो यह तो एक तरह से ऐसा संगठन है जो हर क्षेत्र के लोगों को जो सरकार मे बाहर हैं, जो रिटायर हो गये हैं या जिनके अनुभव का क्षेत्र अपना है उनके अनुभव से लाभ लेने के लिये किया गया है । ऐसा काम करने से हर क्षेत्र में सुविधा होगी । मैं इसमें एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूं प्रधान मंत्री जी को । जब इसमें आन्तरिक सुरक्षा भी शामिल किया है तो कई बिन्दुओं पर आन्तरिक सुरक्षा को ध्यान में रखना चाहिये, जैसे किस जगह में कम्युनल राईट हुआ करते हैं, वह प्रोन एरिया कहां ? तो उस पर ध्यान रखना चाहिये, उसके लिये एक सैल होना चाहिये कि जो नेशनल सिक्योरिटी कौंसिल को इस पर बातचीत करके पहले से एक सूची तैयार रहे कि कहां-कहां कब-कब होते हैं, किस बारे में ?

एक दूसरी बात है—जैसे राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति का भारी मात्रा में नुकसान होता है, वह होता है रेलवे में ।

उसके लिए नेशनल सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल को थोड़ा सा व्यापक बनाया जाए तो कम से कम दो हजार करोड़ की चोरी रेलवे में हम रोक सकते हैं । यहां से हम बुक करते हैं और बीच में चोरी हो जाती है । रेलवे के अफसर और पुलिस के लोग उसमें मिले रहते हैं ... (व्यवधान) मंडल कमीशन तो हो गया ... (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : प्लीज़ अभी आप इसी विषय पर बोलकर बैठ जाइए । प्लीज़ डोंट डिस्टर्ब हिम ।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : महोदया, मैं यह सलाह देना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक इंटरनल सिक्योरिटी का सवाल है तो उसमें दो प्वाइंट मैंने कहे हैं—एक जहां सांप्रदायिक दंगों की संभावना ज्यादा होती है, उस जगह पर और जहां भारी मात्रा में चोरी होती है जिससे राष्ट्रीय सम्पत्ति का नुकसान होता है, ये नोटेड प्वाइंट्स हैं, इन जगहों पर थोड़ा सा हाथ रखने की जरूरत है । उसके लिए एक विशेष सैल बनाने की जरूरत है । धन्यवाद ।

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Madam Deputy Chairperson, I am thankful to the honourable Members for their views and perhaps I cannot defend the case better than Shrimati Sushma Swaraj and General Aurora. I think they have given a complete answer to the debate. Anyway, it is my duty to formally...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I do not know that BJP has that much control.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I never knew that even the best of arguments and objective reasons are blocked by party labels.

Shri Shiv Shankerji asked—primarily the first question—as to what the failure of the previous system was. And that was asked by various Members on the Benches opposite. May I clarify myself to the Leader of the Opposition, it is not necessarily failure everytime? If you pass from the college and graduate into the university, you don't ask, "What was my failure? I have passed this course. Why are you giving me these further textbooks? I have read history and I have passed it. Why are you again giving me more history books of this nature, more voluminous? I have passed in this subject." It is not because of failure that I want to bring this issue here. When a child grows, you give him a bigger shirt. Does the child say, "I am quite happy with my present shirt. Why are you giving me a larger shirt?" The child is growing. He has grown up now. Similarly, the situation has grown. The security environment has changed, not because of the failure of the previous Government. I am not criticising on that

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

point. But the complexities are such that we have to respond to them and our response to them is the National Security Council. And I will not go back and say whether a particular thing would have been better or whether this was a magic wand. No. Rightly Shrimati Sushma Swaraj said, it is ont a magic wand. It is just one step, not the finality. If you like, today—I am not going into the past—if you have to tackle the Punjab problem, the Kashmir problem or the Assam problem or what is emerging in Andhra Pradesh and possibly else-where too, what are the elements that we have to approach? What are the elements that we have to approach in Punjab? One: You have to approach it certainly from the Minstry of Home Affairs. But will only the Home Ministry solve the Punjab problem, given its dimensions? You have to approach it from the political angle. You have to approach it on the Foreign Affairs side. Smuggling and terrorism have merged together. You have to approach from that side. On Kashmir, there is somewhere in the minds of the people some grievance that either on the political side or on the Government side, things were not delivered to them and somewhere we have to approach them If geopolitical situations are changing, we have to see how they will affect this and what impact they will have on this and what role and initiatives we can take to apply pressures on Pakistan. So, no one Department encompasses the whole problem. But the problem will not fragment itself into departments or portions just because you have departments. The Punjab reality is one, and it is organic. The Kashmir reality is one and it is organic. So, they are there. But just because we are compartmentalised, they won't become compartments. But each problem will have to be resolved. Therefore, there is need for a holistic approach. If we have a problem today on balance of payments, how will it affect our Defence purchases? Now, that is an issue between the Ministries of Finance, Commerce and Defence. Now there are remote areas were we do not come in touch with people or they are not coming in touch with us. Delhi is distant. When they we talk about India, anyone coming from such areas comes from India. But there is a feeling of alienation and where has it arisen from? For solving this, many disciplines have to come together. It is not that co-ordination was not being done, I am not criticising that. There are modes and modes of co-ordination and there is no one book written saying that this is the way of co-ordination. There might have been co-ordination and there was co-ordination. I am not even challenging your position. But what we are attempting to do is that we are institutionalising co-ordination by the National Security Council. And, as has been rightly said, it is not a mere crisis management in the sense that when the crisis comes, everybody gets up and wakes up to it. But here it is to consider in advance various factors that are emerging and see how we can operate start taking steps in the respective fields and then avert the crisis or, if it comes, then meet the challenge. So, this really is what is behind this holistic approach.

Now, a point has been raised that it will become a Frankenstein's monster, that it will become too powerful and the Prime Minister can misuse it. This is one end of the spectrum of criticism and the other end is that it is just a sub-committee and there is nothing new about it. I think these are the two sides. Well, we have very clearly stated that we have taken all care to see that the council functions within the Cabinet system because the set-up that we have the Cabinet system or the parliamentary system, we are very conscious that we protect it and we do not create anything that will impinge on Parliament. Within the parliamentary system itself, we have evolved a method of institutionalised, co-ordinated, action in matters of security which today encompasses so many aspects. So, this is the correct position and, I do not think that there should be any fear about it.

Now, Shiv Shankerji mentioned about the United States. Well, that is a Presidential form of Government and we have looked into it and that was not suitable. In the U.K., they function through parliamentary committees. We do not have that system here. There has been a suggestion

as to why there should not be parliamentary committees. We can look into this question. But, today, we do not have parliamentary committees here. Then you mentioned the USSR. Now, the USSR, apart from its Politburo has the Supreme Defence Council which has as its members the General Secretary of the CPSU, the Premier Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, Foreign Minister and Defence Minister, and deals with major strategic and defence and security issues. If you see it, they do have something like coordination in the Supreme Defence Council.

Then a question was asked: what signals are you giving—political signals—to the region? Are you aiming by this to threaten all your neighbours in the region where you are going to play the big brother's role? We have spelt it out. We want to have friendly relations with all our neighbours and we will actively pursue that policy. Well, when it comes to our security or anything like that we will certainly stand up to it. But there is no reason why India should not play a role in this region—constructive role, a stabilising role, a role for peace, in this region, commensurate with its size and its importance. There is no reason why we should not. We should not be apologetic about our role. And I think we should not also shirk our responsibility in this respect. Nehruji...

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: May I draw your attention to what the Foreign Minister said after visiting Maldives? He said that under no circumstances our troops will go outside our territory.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I have not said of troops; I said of the role of peace.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: No, not you; the Foreign Minister.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Yes, right.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Prime Minister, you have finally perfected the art of double-speak. I congratulate you. (*Interruptions*) I congratulate you.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): He is a double-man. He speaks like that. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Some people suffer from the disease of split-vision. (*Interruptions*) They need corrective specs.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: My spectacles, Mr. Prime Minister, see you in at least ten 'avtars' every day—every day.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I didn't know the disease has gone to that extent. I thought only two. (*Interruptions*). You say ten.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Let me assure you, Mr. Prime Minister that the disease is obvious to the entire nation.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Well, you are not using your specs. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I tell you, Mr. Prime Minister, this is a disease which has been shared even with Mr. Arun Shourie, your friend. (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I request the hon. Member not to disturb while the Prime Minister is replying.

We had a very peaceful discussion. Let us conclude.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Now, the reasons is obvious. He is not seeing through his own eyes bu through the other's eyes. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Well spoken, Mr. Prime Minister! (*Interruptions*)

I am a Member of this House. You will not stop me from saying what I want to say. (*Interruptions*). You cannot stop me.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Vishvjit Singh Ji, I think you have had your say. Now, please let him finish. Okay?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has his fundamental right to get excited. You cannot challenge it.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I was saying that in this region now a detente is evolving at the global level, of superpowers. And India does have a role to play. Certainly in this part of the world it has played a part in the world and there is no reason why it should be apologetic about it.

The role of peace, of defusing tensions and of friendship is certainly a role which we should aim at. There is one thing in this region. Asia alone is one region which does not have any particular mechanism for it. So, we should have all these things in mind. The National Security Council is one of the places where such things can be deliberated upon in their various dimensions and we can certainly define our initiative in those respects also taking into account all our potential in foreign policy or our economic strength or our military strength and also our internal situation. All these things can be taken into consideration there.

Then a point was made about our manifesto. Have you taken this decision in a huff? Certainly not. This was being debated in the country not just when we made the manifesto but earlier also. Then it was reflected in our manifesto. It was reflected in the President's address. I took it to the Consultative Committee for the Defence Ministry twice. Dipen Ghoshji, there were representatives every party. Senior members were there. We debated it in detail. Suggestions from your party members came. They participated in it. From BJP also, Shri Jaswant Singh was there. We took them in to full confidence before we came to this stage. Here also the resolution has not yet been signed. We have said that this is what we intend. Again we will listen to the views of the house and then sign the resolution. That is how we are going about obtaining the consensus and that is our effort. It is not a *fait accompli* as if we have come with the resolution saying that now you debate it and formally accept it. I very much appreciate the point and we have followed it.

A point was made about the secretariat. Shiv Shankerji made it and asked when we are reducing expenditure, why there is a new secretariat. Well, the necessary expenditure has to be made. I think that it will save more expenditure later when we have thought our course of action through collectively going through the problem and having a systematic approach to it. Otherwise, we might be spending much more money.

A point was made that the membership is the same as that of the CCPA. Here it is by designation. Finance Minister will look at the economic side. The Home Minister will look at the internal side. Foreign Affairs Minister will look at the external side. The Defence Minister will look at the military side. And there is the Prime Minister who cannot pass on the buck anywhere. So, I am not shirking responsibility as Salveji was saying. Certainly the Prime Minister has to shoulder all the responsibility finally. It is not passing on the responsibility. In the CCPA, any Prime Minister, according to his context, will select the political people. The Prime Minister may need the Environment Minister. He may need the Shipping Minister in the CCPA because of the political clout or weight he may be having and not necessarily because of his portfolio. But here it is functional. Therefore, there is the necessity of not equating it with the CCPA. But it will certainly be functioning within the overall Cabinet system.

The Strategic, Core group will be only a bureaucratic channel. What is the difference from the past system? Otherwise, why not a Cabinet Committee only and then let the papers come? In this system, one paper comes for a decision right away. This is the proposal and one Department puts it up. Some comments come from it. But they have not collectively interacted on various facets of the issue. Here, the Strategic Core Group will collectively apply its mind and then give options. It will not be just one recommendation, either saying 'yes' or 'no'. It will come with options. These are the options — one, two, three. Then the National Security Council which consists of the Ministers and the Prime Minister, can decide. So, it is much more comprehensive, much more useful than the present system that we have. About the Secretariat, if you see the CCPA, you have been there, we have been there, we

have been together. The members are so much over-loaded with political work and departmental work and everything. To deliberate collectively, a body is necessary. The Secretariat will address itself entirely to it. So, that will be a form like a memory bank. Today what is happening? We hardly have a memory bank on Defence. Ministers go away; Governments go away; officers go away. In the files, it is everywhere. But there is a need of some thread of continuity, a memory bank or reservoir of what has happened. Secretariat can usefully provide that thread of memory or reservoir. So, any changes may take place in the political system, but national security as such is not affected because somebody has taken away the ideas along with him.

Now, about the National Security Advisory Board. Here it is to involve the enlightened people who have interest in security, to interact with them. And it is for them to give advice. It is a forum for interaction.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: What will be the strength of this Board?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: This will not be very large.

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE: But maximum?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: I think, it should be round about 30, between 30 and 35. Something like that, oscillating between 30 and 35. That is also on the larger side. It is better if we can compress it to 30 and below. But that might be difficult. But if it is too small, involving very few people, then its purpose is lost. So, it is at that level. That can be a way of informing the people at large because when only Government says something then it becomes Governmental view. But when other people also get involved and convinced and they say about the thing, people are involved. And, I thing, on security matters, I quite agree with Sushma Swarajji that it is not only a Governmental matter, the security of the country to become a national matter, a matter of national consciousness, the consciousness of youth. Perhaps, we have not thought of this aspect. Perhaps, the election politics has too much softened our nation. If somebody says, I will provide the food, then somebody says, I will feed you by the spoon. The time has come for all of us to call upon the nation and the youth, not for the Government, not for the party, but for the country that when there is a need for sacrifice, they should be ready for it. And that motivation has to be generated in the new generation, as the pre-independence leadership had created a motivation for the independence movement. For the defence of the country today, there is a need. Why not awaken the youth for the defence of the country? On the border, we are trying to protect our border from infiltration. We are trying to build this wire-fence. Why not we say, 'let us build the fence; we will complete this in our year or six months' Not only the Government, the youth will also feel that they are doing something. The border is a sacred place, more sacred than any shrine. Just touching the soil should be sacred for the nation. That is the spirit which we should build. And in that sense, I agree that this Advisory Board involving the people and disseminating the spirit of this nature will be necessary.

Then it is said: Why not make it statutory? Why is this Resolution? And even in the formation of the Planning Commission, Article 77 was not invoked. And the Planning Commission was formed by a Government Resolution. But all these doubts were created: That body will become a super-power and all that. It was said that it would be a source of conflict. Now, has the Planning Commission become a super-body? It has powers in regard to the plans of all the Ministries. Has it become an enemy of all the Ministries? The example is there before us, of the Planning Commission. It has not become a parallel Government. Let us not have such fears. We have already the experience in regard to such bodies in our present system.

[Shri Vishwanath Pratap Singh]

I am thankful to Khaleelur Rahmanji for making these points about expenditure, etc. He said that when a new Secretariat is needed, why not spend on it.

Shri Dipen Ghosh mentioned about the Defence Minister Consultative Committee and about the discussions. The point was made about economic policy, the industrial policy, the import-export policy and about the economic power creating a hegemony through the channel of trade. He talked about the country coming into their clutches and their getting absorbed into the system. I would like to point out that if a country is not conscious about it, if a country is not alert about it, it will come into the clutches of such sounks where it finds itself helpless and gets exploited. But we are very conscious. The principle of self-reliance is not going to be given up. Economic independence is not going to be given up. I have said this many times. We will stand by it.

In regard to the industrial policy, it is said that we have opened the doors. There is some misconception here. May I take this occasion to remove it Suppose is Rs. 25 crores investment. Foreign investment i s up to 40 per cent. It will not be much. If you take the debt-equity ratio, 2:1—equity 1 and debt 2—which is the normal form of investment, 40 per cent of this amount, Rs. 25 crores, will be Rs. 8 crores or something like that.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Rs. 10 crores.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Even if it is Rs. 10 crores, one-third of it will be Rs. 3½ crores. With Rs. 3½ crores, do you mean to say that the multi-nationals will come in?

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: It is not a question in terms of the exact money value. It is a question of the presence of the multinationals in fields like agriculture; like, for example, the case of Pepsico in Punjab.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Mr. Prime Minister, will you yield for a minute?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Let me complete my sentence. It will not be open. It is positive. If there is a hole in the door for a rat, will an elephant pass through it? (*Interruptions*). We keep an open eye on this. The NRIs are our own people. If they want to invest Rs. 2 crores, Rs. 3 crores, Rs. 5 crores, what is there? Of course, we are consulting our supporting parties on this. Consultations are going on with our supporting parties and only then we will come up with further proposals.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Let me remind him that the multi-nationals came into India in a very small way. Let me remind him that Glaxo operated in India for 25 years as a private limited company.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: They certainly did not come in the past six months.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: This is the only reply you have.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Before putting questions, search your heart also. Let questions be put from this side and I am ready to answer.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: So, you will only answer the questions that come from that side. Wonderful. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: This is very unfair.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: It is his style. It is all right.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He said, 'also'.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: You did not understand the full context of it. What I am saying is, on a matter on which you yourself could see before putting a question search your heart first. It will be more legitimate if it came from Dipen Ghoshji... (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now let him finish. No more interruptions.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Since the time I have become a Member of this House I have been fighting against the multinationals. You yourself are aware of this because when you were the Finance Minister I used to come to you with various matters which you yourself have taken up. I find it *amazing that you should accuse me of* such...

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Not you, not you personally.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: This is very unfair.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: How can I accuse someone who has a common name?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I take strong exception to this accusation.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Can you yield for a moment?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now no more yielding. Mr. Prime Minister, you please finish your reply.

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: Most of the questions that were raised have been answered. Salveji mentioned, why don't you have trust in yourself, is it that you cannot find your own direction, that you need all this paraphernalia. And a point was raised that other people will be involved and then the security will be risked. After all, when the Prime Minister makes his cabinet... (*Interruptions*)... no security clearance is taken at that time. And I have taken people from outside who have not been elected. That is the discretion of the Prime Minister and that is the system given to us. So, that much faith you should have when you elect a person to be at the helm. He can take care of the national security and I do not think you should have a doubt. Otherwise, we will start doubting our own system.

About Sushmaji, I have already complimented her. I cannot improve on what she has said. I thank her very much.

Shri Kapil Verma said about parallel Government. This has been answered. About security some points have been made. He also raised a point of *fait accompli*. It is not a *fait accompli*.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Will you consult various parties?

SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH: These are the various parties in consultation. What is this House? After all this is the highest place of consultation. This is the ultimate place of consultation.

Shri Raj Mohanji lent support to it and also gave advice. (*Interruptions*). Shri Ram Awadheshji mentioned about ifs and buts. Without ifs and buts he supported. Therefore, I am thankful to him.

SHRI B. L. PANWAR (Rajasthan): We want reply regarding constitutional framework of this Resolution. There was no reply to this effect.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I only request the Prime Minister, even in the calmer moments reconsider the whole thing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have before me a statement of the Finance Minister. It is a long statement. If the House so agrees, he can lay it on the Table of the House. Tomorrow we can take it up at 5.30 or so in the evening. So, the Minister may lay it on the Table of the House. Clarifications will be tomorrow. (*Interruptions*). No, no, at 12 o'clock I won't permit. I have other legislative business.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam, this is a very important policy statement. It was there in the List of Business of 27th and today also it has come. (*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will sit a little late but I will not allow it at 12 o'clock tomorow. I have other legislative business. If you like to finish it, I am prepared to sit here. I am prepared to sit here to finish all the discussion. Do you want to finish the discussion? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Every day the Government comes with a statement....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you do not want....That is what I said. Let me say to the Members, let him lay it on the Table of the House and we will have the clarifications tomorrow, but not at 12 o'clock. I have legislative business. You sit down. Let him lay it on the Table.

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : स्पेशल मेंशन ...(व्यवधान) मैडम, इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी पर ...(व्यवधान)

उपसभापति : आप अभी बैठ जाइये।

वित्त मंत्री (प्रो. मधु दंडवते) : इंडस्ट्रियल पालिसी नहीं है, भाई। ...(व्यवधान)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me finish this business. Today we are doing the business in a very orderly manner. I thank you very much. Let him lay it. Let us go about in the same manner. We finished our work in good time. Let us continue with this good habit. Let him lay it on the Table. Then I will allow you. This statement has nothing to do with the Industrial Policy. It is a different statement. Please sit down... Take your seats, please Thank you very much.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE. BUDGETARY DEFICIT

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): Madam, I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the budgetary deficit in pursuance of a commitment made by me while presenting the Budget for 1990-91.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up half-an-hour-discussion.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): Madam, before you take that up ...(*Interuptions*)

SHRI S. B. CHAVAN (Maharashtra): What about the copies of the statement?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please distribute the copies... एक मिनट। एक-एक वक्त में एक-एक काम होता है। एक साथ में सब हो नहीं पाएगा। इसलिए आप कृपया शांत रहें।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : स्पेशल मेंशन होगा कि नहीं आएगा।

उपसभापति : अभी मैं उनका जवाब तो दे दूं। फिर जवाब दूंगी। बोलिये।

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: The Industrial Policy discussion started on the 20th. For two hours, we discussed it. Next day it appeared on the agenda, but was not taken up. Since then, every day it is being put on the agenda, but at the fag end of the day. I, therefore, request that Industrial Policy should be taken up tomorrow after the clarifications by the Finance Minister...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The clarifications will not be at 12 o'clock, but will come in the evening and not in the morning. I have legislative business.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: Madam, eight days have passed...